

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the claims

Claims 1-16 and 26-48 are pending. Claims 17-25 are canceled without prejudice as being drawn to a non-elected species of the invention.

Claims rejections

Claims 1, 12, 26-27, 30-32, 34-37, 42-43, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gundelfinger (US 4,068,528).

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-16, 28-29, 33, and 47-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundelfinger in view of Sakai (US 4,937,048).

Dependent claims 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundelfinger in view of Lecerf (US 4,705,059).

Applicants request reconsideration of these rejections in view of the following arguments.

Claims 1-16 and 26-48

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 26 and 46 are novel and patentable over Gundelfinger because, for instance, Gundelfinger does not disclose or suggest a housing having a plurality of chambers or a valve body having a fluid processing region coupled fluidically with a fluid displacement region.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that Gundelfinger shows a plurality of chambers F1-F6. Actually, F1-F6 are very small holes (e.g., 0.010 inch in diameter) in the stator (column 9, lines 8-9). Even if one tried to construe these holes as a "plurality of chambers," Gundelfinger's device would still lack a valve body having a fluid processing region. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that Gundelfinger shows a valve body having a fluid processing region 30. Actually, 30 is a sample loop formed by a piece of tubing that Gundelfinger specifically teaches is external to the valve

(column 6, line 31). Thus, Gundelfinger does not teach or suggest a valve body having a fluid processing region coupled fluidically with a fluid displacement region. Instead, Gundelfinger specifically teaches a very different structure than the valve body with a fluid processing region as recited by applicants in independent claims 1, 26 and 46.

Sakai and Lecerf fail to remedy the shortcomings of Gundelfinger.


For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 26 and 46, as well as claims 2-15, 27-45 and 47-48 depending therefrom are patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth A. Weber
Reg. No. 31,677

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
KAW:jhd
60649050 v1